arXiv:1510.06394v1 [math.AP] 21 Oct 2015

THE FULLY NONLINEAR STOCHASTIC IMPULSE CONTROL PROBLEM

ROHIT JAIN

Abstract. In this paper, motivated by a problem in stochastic impulse control theory, we aim to study solutions to a free boundary problem of obstacle-type. We obtain sharp estimates for the solution using nonlinear tools which are independent of the modulus of semi-convexity of the obstacle. This allows us to state a general estimate for solutions to free boundary problems of obstacle-type admitting obstacles with a general modulus of semi-convexity. As an application we prove sharp estimates for the solution to a fully nonlinear stochastic impulse control problem.

1. Introduction

Stochastic impulse control problems ([2], [13], [14], [8]) are control problems that fall between classical diffusion control and optimal stopping problems. In such problems the controller is allowed to instantaneously move the state process by a certain amount every time the state exits the non-intervention region. This allows for the controlled process to have sample paths with jumps. There is an enormous literature studying stochastic impulse control models and many of these models have found a wide range of applications in electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, quantum engineering, robotics, image processing, and mathematical finance. A key operator in stochastic impulse control problems is the intervention operator

$$\mathrm{M}u(x) = \inf_{\xi \geq 0}(u(x+\xi)+1). \tag{1}$$

The operator represents the value of the strategy that consists of taking the best immediate action in state x and behaving optimally afterward. Since it is not always optimal to intervene, this leads to the quasi-variational inequality

$$u(x) \leq \mathrm{M}u(x) \ \ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{2}$$

From the analytic perspective one obtains an obstacle problem where the obstacle depends implicitly and nonlocally on the solution. More precisely we can consider the classical stochastic impulse control problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) \geq f(x) & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u(x) \leq Mu(x) & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u = 0 & \forall x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Here we let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with a $C^{2,\alpha}$ boundary $\partial\Omega$, $u \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$,

$f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $f \geq 0$, and

$$\mathrm{M}u(x) = \inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi \in \bar{\Omega}}} (u(x+\xi) + 1). \tag{3}$$

The assumption $f \geq 0$ implies that the solution $\bar{u}$ to the boundary value problem $\Delta \bar{u} = f$ in Ω with $\bar{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ satisfies $\bar{u} \geq 0$. This implies in particular that the set of solutions to $v \leq M\bar{u}$ with $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is nonempty. This allows for an iterative procedure to prove existence and uniqueness of the solution ([2]). We also point out that the sharp $C^{1,1}_{loc}$ estimate in the classical stochastic impulse control problem has been previously obtained ([3], [4]). In this paper we consider a fully nonlinear problem. We let $F(D^2u)$ be a fully nonlinear uniformly elliptic operator i.e. $\lambda\|P\| \leq F(A+P) - F(P) \leq \Lambda\|P\|$ $\forall P \geq 0$ and $A, P \in \mathbf{S}(n)$, where $\mathbf{S}(n)$ is the set of all $n \times n$ real symmetric matrices. We also assume that the operator is either convex or concave in the hessian variable. We define $\varphi_u(x)$ to be a semi-convex function with a general modulus of semi-convexity $\omega(r)$. We consider the following boundary value problem.

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2u) \leq 0 & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u(x) \geq \varphi_u(x) & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u = 0 & \forall x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

In this work we are interested in proving sharp estimates for fully nonlinear obstacle problems admitting obstacles with a general modulus of semi-convexity. The following are our main results in this direction.

Theorem 1. *Consider the fully nonlinear obstacle problem with obstacle φ_u, admitting a modulus of semi-convexity, $\omega(r)$. Then the solution u has a modulus of continuity $\omega(r)$ up to $C^{1,1}(\Omega)$.*

As an application we apply our result to obtain a sharp estimate for the solution to the following fully nonlinear stochastic impulse control problem:

Theorem 2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with a $C^{2,\alpha}$ boundary $\partial\Omega$. Define*

$$Mu(x) = \varphi(x) + \inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi \in \bar{\Omega}}} (u(x+\xi)). \tag{5}$$

Here $\varphi(x)$ is $\omega(r)$ semi-concave, strictly positive, bounded, and decreasing in the positive cone $\xi \geq 0$. Consider the solution to the following fully nonlinear stochastic impulse control problem,

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2u) \geq 0 & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u(x) \leq \mathrm{M}u(x) & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u = 0 & \forall x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Then, the solution u has modulus of continuity $\omega(r)$ up to $C^{1,1}(\Omega)$.

We remark that as a corollary of this theorem we recover the sharp $C^{1,1}$ estimate for the classical stochastic impulse control problem.

In the rest of this paper, we proceed in stages to prove the stated theorems. The main point of interest in the first theorem is to improve the modulus of continuity for the obstacle φ_u on the contact set $\{u = \varphi_u\}$. In particular the goal is to obtain a uniform modulus of continuity $\omega(r)$ for φ_u which we can then propogate to the solution u. The second theorem follows from the first theorem once we are able to show that the nonlocal obstacle $Mu(x)$ admits a modulus of semi-concavity $\omega(r)$.

Acknowledgements I would like to express my sincerest gratitude and deepest apprecation to my thesis advisors Professor Luis A. Caffarelli and Professor Alessio Figalli. It has been a truly rewarding experience learning from them and having their guidance.

2. Continuity of the Solution

Existence of a lower semi-continous viscosity super solution follows from standard viscosity solution theory, in particular Perron's Method. Our motivation is to study the regularity estimates for the solution. We start by first proving that solutions to (4) are continuous.

Lemma 1. *Let u be a solution to (4) with semi-convex obstacle φ_u. Then $u \in C(\Omega)$.*

The lemma follows from a result due to Evans.

Lemma 2. *If u is continuous in $\{u = \varphi_u\}$, then u is continuous in Ω.*

Proof. The possibility of a discontinuity is limited to a point on the free boundary, $\partial\{u > \varphi_u\}$. Consider $x_0 \in \{u = \varphi_u\}$ and without loss of generality assume $u(x_0) = 0$. Suppose by contradiction, that there exists a sequence of points $\{x_k\}$ with the following properties:
1. $\{x_k\} \to x_0$.
2. $\forall k$, $x_k \in \{u > \varphi_u\}$.
3. $\mu = \lim_{x_k \to x_0} u(x_k) > u(x_0) = 0$.

By lower semicontinuity of u, we know that $\forall \delta > 0$ there exists a neighborhood of x_0 such that $u \geq -\delta$ for $\delta << \mu$. We consider

$$r_k = \text{dist}[x_k, \{u = \varphi_u\}].$$

For a large enough k we can ensure that:
1. $u(x) + \delta \geq 0$ in $B_{r_k}(x_k)$.
2. $u(x_k) + \delta \geq \frac{\mu}{2}$.

Moreover we know that $u(x) + \delta$ satisfies the equation in $B_{r_k}(x_k)$. By the Harnack Inequality we obtain,

$$\frac{\mu}{2} \leq u(x_k) + \delta \leq C \inf_{B_{\frac{r_k}{2}}(x_k)} (u + \delta).$$

This implies for some $C_0 > 0$ universal,

$$\inf_{B_{\frac{r_k}{2}}(x_k)} u \geq C_0 \mu.$$

Since u is also superharmonic, we know from the weak Harnack Inequality in $B_{4r_k}(y_k)$ that,

$$\begin{aligned} u(y_k) &\geq c\left(\int_{B_{2r_k}(y_k)} u^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= c\left(\int_{B_{2r_k}(y_k)\setminus B_{\frac{r_k}{2}}(x_k)} u^p + \int_{B_{\frac{r_k}{2}}(x_k)} u^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\geq c\left(-(\delta)^p|B_{2r_k}| + (C_0\mu)^p|B_{\frac{r_k}{2}}|\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\geq C_1\mu \quad \text{for } C_1 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand $u(y_k) = \varphi_u(y_k)$ and $y_k \to x_0$. This implies in particular that:
1. $\varphi_u(y_k) \geq C_1\mu$.
2. $\varphi(x_0) = u(x_0) = 0$.
This is our desired contradiction. □

Remark 1. *We observe that the conditions on the obstacle may be relaxed in the proof of this lemma. In fact continuity of the obstacle is sufficient.*

3. $C^{\omega(r)}$ Estimate for the Solution

We start this section by stating and proving a lemma in the particular case that our operator is the Laplacian. The motivating calculation will help us proceed to prove the desired estimate in the more general case. The content of the lemma says that for any given point $x_1 \in \{u(x) > \varphi_u(x)\}$, $\exists x_0 \in \{u(x) = \varphi_u(x)\}$ such that the solution grows at most by $\omega(2|x_1 - x_0|)$ where $\omega(|x_1 - x_0|)$ denotes the modulus of semi-convexity for the obstacle on the ball $B_{|x_1-x_0|}(x_0)$. Since a lower estimate is available via the obstacle, what we aim to show is that around a fixed contact point the modulus of continuity of the solution is controlled by the modulus of semi-convexity of the obstacle.

Lemma 3. *Let $\varphi_u(x)$ be a semi-convex function with general modulus of semiconvexity $\omega(r)$. Consider the following obstacle problem:*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u \leq 0 & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u(x) \geq \varphi_u(x) & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u = 0 & \forall x \in \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Fix $x \in \{u(x) > \varphi_u(x)\}$ and define $L_{x_0}(x) = \varphi_u(x_0) + \langle p, x - x_0\rangle$, the linear part of the obstacle at the point x_0. Then $\exists x_0 \in \{u(x) = \varphi_u(x)\}$ and $C(n) > 0$ such that $u(x) - L_{x_0}(x) \leq C(n)\omega(2|x - x_0|)$.

Proof. We fix $x_1 \in \{u(x) > \varphi_u(x)\}$. Let x_0 denote the closest point to x_1 in $\{u = \varphi_u\}$. We denote this distance by $\rho = |x_1 - x_0|$. Define $w(x) = u(x) - L_{x_0}(x)$. Using the mean value theorem for superharmonic functions in $B_{2\rho}(x_0)$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = w(x_0) &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha(n)2^n\rho^n}\int_{B_{2\rho}(x_0)} w(y)\, dy \\ &= K(n)\int_{B_{2\rho}(x_0)\setminus B_\rho(x_1)} w(y)\, dy \; + K(n)\int_{B_\rho(x_1)} w(y)\, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Semi-convexity of $w(x)$ in $B_{2\rho}(x_0)$ and an application of the mean value theorem for harmonic functions in $B_\rho(x_1)$ implies,

$$\begin{aligned}&\geq K(n)\int_{B_{2\rho}(x_0)\setminus B_\rho(x_1)} -\omega(2|y-x_0|)+C_1(n)w(x_1)\\&\geq -\tilde{C}(n)\omega(2\rho)+C_1(n)w(x_1).\end{aligned}$$

In particular we obtain the desired bound,

$$w(x_1)\leq C(n)\omega(2\rho).$$

□

We now look to generalize the previous argument in the fully nonlinear setting. In the preceding proof the lower bound on the obstacle was transferred to the solution at the contact point. Moreover we were able to renormalize the solution by subtracting off a linear part. We will also need a generalization of the mean value theorem that was used to connect pointwise information with information about the measure Δu.

We consider again (4). For clarity we set $\omega(r)=\bar{C}r^2$ for some positive constant $\bar{C}>0$. The arguments presented below can be trivially modified for the general semi-convex modulus by an appropriate rescaling. We make a remark in this direction towards the end of this section.

Lemma 4. *Let $x_1\in\{u>\varphi_u\}$. Then $\exists x_0\in\{u=\varphi_u\}$ such that for $w(x)=u(x)-L_{x_0}(x)$, where $L_{x_0}(x)=\varphi_u(x_0)+\langle p,x-x_0\rangle$ denotes the linear part of the obstacle at the point x_0, and a universal constant $K(n)>0$,*

$$w(x_1)\leq K(n)|x_1-x_0|^2.$$

Proof. Fix $x_1\in\{u>\varphi_u\}$. Let x_0 be the closest point to x_1 in $\{u=\varphi_u\}$. We denote this distance by $\rho=|x_1-x_0|$. By the modulus of semi-convexity of the obstacle we know that $w(x)\geq -16\bar{C}\rho^2$ on $B_{4\rho}(x_0)$. The idea of the proof is to zoom out to scale 1 and prove that the solution is bounded by a universal constant and then rescale back to obtain the desired bound. Consider the transformation $y=\frac{x-x_0}{\rho}$ and the scaled solution,

$$v(y)=\frac{w(\rho y+x_0)}{16\bar{C}\rho^2}+1. \tag{8}$$

We note that $v(y)$ is a non-negative supersolution on $B_4(0)$ with $\inf_{B_4(0)}v(y)\leq 1$. Moreover $v(y)$ is a solution in $B_1(y_1)$, since x_0 is the closest point in the contact set to x_1. By the interior Harnack Inequality,

$$v(y_1)\leq \sup_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(y_1)} v(y)\leq C\inf_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(y_1)} v(y).$$

We also know from the weak L^ϵ estimate for supersolutions that,

$$|\{v\geq t\}\cap B_2(0)|\leq dt^{-\epsilon}\ \ \forall t>0.$$

We observe that $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(y_1) \subseteq B_2(0)$. Hence we can choose $t = t_0$ such that

$$|\{v \geq t\} \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}(y_1)| < \frac{1}{2}|B_{\frac{1}{2}}(y_1)|.$$

An application of the interior Harnack Inequality yields,

$$v(y_1) \leq Ct_0.$$

This implies from (8),

$$\frac{w(\rho y_1 + x_0)}{4\bar{C}\rho^2} \leq Ct_0.$$

Rescaling back we obtain our desired estimate,

$$w(x_1) \leq K|x_1 - x_0|^2.$$

□

We now prove a lemma that controls the oscillation of the solution between two arbitrary points on the contact set $\{u = \varphi_u\}$. As a corollary which we state after the proof we improve the modulus of continuity for the obstacle φ_u on the contact set $\{u = \varphi_u\}$.

Lemma 5. *Let $x_1 \in \{u = \varphi_u\}$ and $x_0 \in \{u = \varphi_u\}$. Then for $w(x) = u(x) - L_{x_0}(x)$, where $L_{x_0}(x) = \varphi_u(x_0) + \langle p, x - x_0\rangle$ denotes the linear part of the obstacle at the point x_0, and $K(n) > 0$ a universal constant,*

$$w(x_1) \leq K(n)|x_1 - x_0|^2.$$

Proof. Assume by contradiction that for an arbitrary large constant $K > 0$

$$w \geq K|x_1 - x_0|^2. \tag{9}$$

As before we denote the distance between the points by $\rho = |x_1 - x_0|$. We begin with a claim.

Claim 1. $\exists$ Half Ball $HB_\rho(x_1)$ such that $\forall x \in HB_\rho(x_1),\ w(x) \geq \frac{K}{2}\rho^2$.

Proof. We define $\varphi_w = \varphi_u - L_{x_0}$, where as before $L_{x_0} = \varphi_u(x_0) + \langle p, x - x_0\rangle$ for $p \in D^+\varphi_u(x_0)$ the superdifferential of φ_u at the point x_0. We make the following observations:
1. $w \geq \varphi_w \quad \forall x \in B_{2\rho}(x_0)$.
2. $\varphi_w(x_1) = \varphi_u(x_1) - \varphi_u(x_0) + \langle p, x - x_1\rangle - \langle p, x - x_0\rangle \quad \forall x \in B_{2\rho}(x_0)$.

In particular,

$$w(x) \geq \varphi_w(x_1) + \varphi_u(x) - \varphi_u(x_1) - \langle p, x - x_1\rangle.$$

Now consider $d \in D^+\varphi_u(x_1)$ and observe that $w(x_1) = \varphi_w(x_1)$. This produces the following inequality,

$$w(x) \geq w(x_1) + \varphi_u(x) - \varphi_u(x_1) - \langle d, x - x_1\rangle - \langle p - d, x - x_1\rangle.$$

By semi-convexity on $B_\rho(x_1)$, (9), and fixing $x \in HB_\rho(x_1) = \{x \in B_\rho(x_1) \mid \langle p - d, x - x_1\rangle \leq 0\}$, we have,

$$w(x) \geq K\rho^2 - \bar{C}\rho^2.$$

We can choose K large enough so that we obtain,

$$w(x) \geq \frac{K}{2}\rho^2.$$

This is our desired half ball. □

We now consider again the dilated solution $v(y)$ from the previous lemma (8). By the weak Harnack Inequality for supersolutions, $\exists C > 0$ universal and $\epsilon > 0$ such that,

$$\int_{B_4(0)} |v(x)|^{\epsilon/2} \leq C \inf_{B_2(0)} v(x) \leq Cv(0) = C.$$

From our previous claim we obtain

$$0 < |\{v(y) > \frac{K}{32\bar{C}}\} \cap B_1(y_1)|.$$

Here $\bar{C}$ is our semi-convexity constant from before. We now have the following chain of inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &< |\{v(y) > \frac{K}{32\bar{C}}\} \cap B_1(y_1)| \, (\frac{K}{32\bar{C}})^{\epsilon/2} \\
&= \int_{\{v(x) > \frac{K}{32\bar{C}}\} \cap B_1(y_1)} (\frac{K}{32\bar{C}})^{\epsilon/2} \\
&\leq \int_{\{v(x) > \frac{K}{32\bar{C}}\} \cap B_1(y_1)} |v(x)|^{\epsilon/2} \\
&\leq \int_{B_4(0)} |v(x)|^{\epsilon/2} \leq C \inf_{B_2(0)} v(x) \leq Cv(0) = C.
\end{aligned}$$

For K large enough we obtain a contradiction. Hence for a universal constant $K(n) > 0$,

$$w(x_1) \leq K(n)|x_1 - x_0|^2.$$

□

Remark 2. *As pointed out above, the statements hold in the case of a more general modulus of semi-convexity. Assume our obstacle is semi-convex on $B_r(x)$ with modulus of semi-convexity $\omega(r)$. We can translate our solution to the origin and scale by the modulus of semi-convexity of the obstacle. In particular, setting ρ to be the distance between our fixed points.*

$$v(y) = \frac{w(\rho y + x_0)}{\omega(4\rho)} + 1. \tag{10}$$

One can check that we get similar estimates in terms of the modulus of semi-convexity $\omega(\rho)$.

Remark 3. *A corollary of the previous lemma is that on the contact set $\{u = \varphi_u\}$ the obstacle φ_u has a modulus of continuity $\omega(r)$. In particular,*

$$\|\varphi_u\|_{C^{\omega(r)}(\{u=\varphi_u\})} \leq C. \tag{11}$$

We can now state and prove a sharp estimate for our solutions.

Theorem 3. *Consider the boundary value problem (4) with semi-convex obstacle φ_u admitting a modulus of semi-convexity, $\omega(r)$. Then the solution u has modulus of continuity $\omega(r)$ up to $C^{1,1}(\Omega)$. In particuluar,*

$$\|u\|_{C^{\omega(r)}(\Omega)} \leq C. \tag{12}$$

Proof. To prove this theorem we consider three distinct cases.

Case 1: $x_1 \in \{u > \varphi_u\}$, $x_0 \in \{u = \varphi_u\}$.
Choose the closest point in the contact set to x_1 and call it $\bar{x}_1$. Then we apply Lemma 4 to obtain the correct oscillation estimate up to the free boundary. Then an application of Lemma 5 gives us the correct oscillation estimate between two contact points. Finally we use the triangle inequality to conclude.

Case 2: x_1, $x_0 \in \{u = \varphi_u\}$.
This is the content of Lemma 5.

Case 3: x_1, $x_0 \in \{u > \varphi_u\}$.
We distinguish two different subcases.

Case 3a: $\max\{d(x_1, \{u = \varphi_u\}), d(x_0, \{u = \varphi_u\})\} \geq 4|x_1 - x_2|$.
Suppose $\max\{d(x_1, \{u = \varphi_u\}), d(x_2, \{u = \varphi_u\})\} = \rho$. Without loss of generality we assume that the maximum distance is realized at the point x_1. We observe that $B_{|x_1 - x_0|}(x_1) \subseteq B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(x_1)$, and we consider $w = u - L_{x_1}$, where L_{x_1} denotes the linear part of the solution at x_1. By an application of the Harnack Inequality we obtain,

$$\sup_{B_\rho(x_1)} w \leq C \inf_{B_{\rho/2}(x_1)} w \leq Cw(x_2) \leq C\omega(\rho).$$

We also appeal to the interior estimate for solutions to our fully nonlinear convex or concave operator, $F(D^2u)$,

$$\|w - w(x_1)\|_{C^{\omega(\rho)}(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(x_1))} \leq \frac{K}{\omega(\rho)} \|w - w(x_1)\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(x_1))}.$$

Hence,

$$\|w - w(x_1)\|_{C^{\omega(\rho)}(B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}(x_1))} \leq C.$$

Case3b: $\max\{d(x_1, \{u = \varphi_u\}), d(x_2, \{u = \varphi_u\})\} < 4|x_1 - x_2|$
In this case one considers $\rho_1 = d(x_1, \{u = \varphi_u\})$ and $\rho_0 = d(x_0, \{u = \varphi_u\})$. Let $\bar{x}_1$ be the closest contact point to x_1 and $\bar{x}_0$ the closest contact point to x_0. We can apply Lemma 4 to obtain the desired oscillation estimate for each point up to the free boundary. We then apply Lemma 5 to control the oscillation between two contact points. Finally we apply the triangle inequality to conclude. □

4. Application to Stochastic Impulse Control Theory

In the previous section we obtained a general estimate for fully nonlinear obstacle problems admitting an obstacle with a general modulus of semi-convexity. In this section we would like to apply the estimate to a particular fully nonlinear obstacle problem arising in stochastic impulse control theory. The idea is to prove that the given obstacle $Mu(x)$ is semi-concave with modulus of semiconcavity $\omega(r)$. The

strategy of the proof will follow the ideas presented in ([3]). We point out that the existence and uniqueness of a continuous viscosity solution to the fully nonlinear stochastic impulse control problem follows from introducing the Pucci Extremal Operators (see chapter 2 in [5]) and adapting the arguments in ([11]). What one also needs to do is use Evans Lemma iteratively on a sequence of solutions to the fully nonlinear obstacle problem with continuous obstacle (See Remark 1).

Theorem 4. *Let $\varphi(x)$ be $\omega(r)$ semi-concave, strictly positive, bounded, and decreasing in the positive cone $\xi \geq 0$. Then the Obstacle*

$$Mu(x) = \varphi(x) + \inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi \in \Omega}} u(x+\xi)$$

is semi-concave with modulus of semi-concavity $\omega(r)$.

Proof. We consider two distinct cases:
1. $x_0 \in \{u = Mu\}$.
2. $x_0 \in \{u < Mu\}$.

Case 1: Fix $x_0 \in \{u = Mu\}$.
The proof in this case is based on characterizing the set where the infimum of u occurs and establishing that this set is uniformly contained in the non-contact region $\{u < Mu\}$. This is the content of the following claims. We define the following sets:
1. $\Sigma_{\geq x_0} = \{x_0 + \xi \ : \ \xi \geq 0\}$.
2. $\Sigma_{x_0} = \{\varphi(x_0) + u(x_0+\xi) = Mu(x_0)\}$.

The following claim characterizes Σ_{x_0} as the set of points where u realizes its infimum.

Claim 2. *For every $y \in (\Sigma_{\geq x_0} \setminus \Sigma_{x_0})$ and for every $x \in \Sigma_{x_0}$, $u(x) \leq u(y)$.*

Proof. Fix $\bar{x} \in \Sigma_{x_0}$. Suppose by contradiction that $\exists x_1 \in \Sigma_{\geq x_0} \setminus \Sigma_{x_0}$ such that $u(x_1) < u(\bar{x})$. This implies the following chain of inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x_0) + u(x_1) &< \varphi(x_0) + u(\bar{x}) \\ &= Mu(x_0) = \varphi(x_0) + \inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x_0+\xi \in \Omega}} u(x_0+\xi). \end{aligned}$$

In particular we obtain,

$$u(x_1) < \inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x_0+\xi \in \Omega}} u(x_0+\xi).$$

This is our desired contradiction. □

We now prove that pointwise the elements of Σ_{x_0} are contained in the non-contact region, $\{u < Mu\}$.

Claim 3. *Suppose the solution to the Boundary Value Problem $F(D^2\bar{u}) = 0$ satisfies*

$$\bar{u} < \inf_{\partial\Omega} \varphi.$$

Then $\forall x \in \Sigma_{x_0}$ it follows that $u(x) < Mu(x)$.
Moreover in a neighborhood N_1 of x we have $u \in C^{1,1}(N_1)$

Proof. We observe that the first statement ensures that $\Sigma_{x_0} \cap (\partial\Omega) = \varnothing$. Suppose $x_0 \in \Omega^\circ$, $x \in \partial\Omega$ and $x_0 \leq x$. Then we observe,

$$\begin{aligned} Mu(x_0) &= u(x_0) \\ &\leq \bar{u}(x_0) < \inf_{\partial\Omega} \varphi \leq \varphi(x) + u(x) \leq \varphi(x_0) + u(x). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows because $\varphi(x)$ is monotonically decreasing in the cone. Hence in particular $\Sigma_{x_0} \cap (\partial\Omega) = \varnothing$.

Suppose now by contradiction that $\exists x \in \Sigma_{x_0}$ such that $u(x) = Mu(x)$. Then we have the following chain of inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_0) &= Mu(x_0) \\ &= \varphi(x_0) + u(x) \\ &= \varphi(x_0) + Mu(x) \geq \varphi(x_0) + Mu(x_0) > Mu(x_0) \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the strict positivity of the function φ. But we observe that the inequality contradicts the obstacle constraint $u(x_0) \leq Mu(x_0)$. Hence we have reached our desired contradiction.

Finally the last statement of the claim follows from the continuity of u. The continuity of the solution implies that $\{u < Mu\}$ is an open set and thus in a small neighborhood N_1 of x, u satisfies the equation, $F(D^2u) = 0$. We can therefore apply interior regularity estimates to conclude. □

We now strenghten the previous claim to obtain a uniform neighborhood of Σ_{x_0} that is strictly contained in the non-contact region.

Claim 4. *$\exists \delta_0 > 0$ such that $d\{\{u = Mu\}, \Sigma_{x_0}\} > \delta_0$.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction $\exists \{\delta_k\} \searrow 0$ and $\{x_k\} \subset \Sigma_{x_0}$, such that

$$d(x_k, \{u = Mu\}) < \delta_k.$$

By definition, $x_k \in \Sigma_{x_0}$, implies

$$\varphi(x_0) + u(x_k) = Mu(x_0) \ \ \forall k.$$

By the continuity of $u(x)$ this implies in particular that $\varphi(x_0) + u(\bar{x}) = Mu(x_0)$ for some $\bar{x} \in \{u = Mu\}$. On the other hand, $\varphi(x_0) + u(\bar{x}) = Mu(x_0)$ implies $\bar{x} \in \Sigma_{x_0}$. Hence from the previous claim we obtain,

$$Mu(\bar{x}) = u(\bar{x}) < Mu(\bar{x}).$$

This is our desired contradiction. □

We now state and prove a claim which allows us to redefine the obstacle in the neighborhood of a contact point.

Claim 5. *For every $x, \bar{x} \in \Omega$, $\exists \delta > 0$, such that if $|x - x_0| < \delta$, and $d(\bar{x}, \Sigma_{x_0}) > \delta$, then $u(x) < \varphi(x) + u(\bar{x})$. Moreover, if $x \in \{u = Mu\}$, then $\bar{x} \notin \Sigma_x$.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that there exists a sequence of points $\{x_k\}$ and $\{\bar{x}_{k'}\}$ satisfying:
1. $|x_k - x_0| = \delta_k$.
2. $d(\bar{x}_{k'}, \Sigma_0) > \delta_{k'} > 0$.

3. $\{\delta_k\} \searrow 0$ and $\{\delta_{k'}\} \searrow 0$.
4. $u(x_k) \geq \varphi(x_k) + u(\bar{x}_{k'})$ $\forall k$ and $\forall k'$.

We observe that from the previous claim $\exists k_0, k_0'$, such that $\forall k \geq k_0$ we have the following chain of inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} Mu(x_0+\delta_k) &\leq Mu(\bar{x}_{k_0'}) \\ &\leq \varphi(\bar{x}_{k_0'}) + u(\bar{x}_{k_0'}) \\ &\leq \varphi(x_0+\delta_k) + u(\bar{x}_{k_0'}) \\ &\leq u(x_0+\delta_k) \leq Mu(x_0+\delta_k). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the above inequalities are all equalities. This implies $\forall k \geq k_0$,

$$Mu(x_0+\delta_k) = \varphi(x_0+\delta_k) + u(\bar{x}_{k_0'}).$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ we obtain,

$$Mu(x_0) = \varphi(x_0) + u(\bar{x}_{k_0'}).$$

Which implies in particular that $\bar{x}_{k_0'} \in \Sigma_{x_0}$. This is our desired contradiction. □

From the last claim we can redefine the obstacle for $V_\delta = \{|x - x_0| < \delta\}$. In particular by taking δ sufficiently small $\exists N_2$ neighborhood of Σ_{x_0} such that,

$$Mu(x) = \varphi(x) + \inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi \in N_2}} u(x+\xi).$$

For an even smaller δ,

$$Mu(x) = \varphi(x) + \inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x_0+\xi \in N_3}} u(x+\xi).$$

Where N_3 is such that,

$$V_\delta + N_3 - x_0 \subseteq N_1.$$

Here N_1 is the neighborhood obtained in Claim 3. In particular for $x \in V_\delta$ and $\xi \in N_3 - x_0$, we can bound the second incremental quotients.

$$\delta^2 u = u(x+h+\xi) + u(x-h+\xi) - 2u(x+\xi) \leq c|h|^2.$$

Moreover we know that for some $x + \bar{\xi}$ in N_1, we have,

$$\inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi \in N_1}} u(x+\xi) = u(x+\bar{\xi}).$$

Now we consider the second incremental quotients of the obstacle $Mu(x)$. By the semi-concavity of φ we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 Mu(x) &\leq \omega(h) + u(x+\bar{\xi}+h) + u(x+\bar{\xi}-h) - 2u(x+\bar{\xi}) \\ &\leq \omega(h) + c|h|^2 \\ &\leq C\omega(h). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in a neighborhood of a contact point, $Mu(x)$ is semi-concave with semi-concavity modulus $\omega(h)$.

Case 2: Fix $x \in \{u < Mu\}$. We argue as before by considering the second incremental quotients of the obstacle, $\delta^2 Mu(x)$. We observe that the infimum of u

in the positive cone, $\xi \geq 0$, must always be realized at a non-contact point. Suppose $\exists\, x+\xi_1 \in \{u = Mu\}$ satisfing,

$$\inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi \in \Omega}} u(x+\xi) = u(x+\xi_1).$$

Then from **Case 1** there exists $\xi_2 \in \Sigma_{x+\xi_1} \subset \{u < Mu\}$ such that,

$$\inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi_1+\xi \in \Omega}} u(x+\xi_1+\xi) = u(x+\xi_1+\xi_2).$$

Since $\xi_1 + \xi_2 \geq 0$, we have found a positive vector admissiable to

$$\inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi \in \Omega}} u(x+\xi).$$

Furthermore, $u(x+\xi_1+\xi_2) \leq u(x+\xi_1)$. Hence we conclude that for a fixed $x \in \{u < Mu\}$ and for some $x+\bar{\xi}$ in $\{u < Mu\}$,

$$\inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi \in \Omega}} u(x+\xi) = u(x+\bar{\xi}).$$

Moreover from Claim 4 we know that $x+\bar{\xi}$ is a uniform positive distance away from the contact set $\{u = Mu\}$. Hence there exists a uniform neighborhood N_0 of points around $x+\bar{\xi}$ where $\{u < Mu\}$. In a smaller neighborhood N_1, $u \in C^{1,1}(N_1)$. In particular for $x+\xi \in N_1$, we can bound again the second incremental quotients,

$$u(x+h+\xi) + u(x-h+\xi) - 2u(x+\xi) \leq c|h|^2$$

Using once more the semi-concavity estimate on $\varphi(x)$ and for some $x+\bar{\xi}$ in N_1 we find,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 Mu(x) &\leq \omega(h) + u(x+\bar{\xi}+h) + u(x+\bar{\xi}-h) - 2u(x+\bar{\xi}) \\ &\leq \omega(h) + c|h|^2 \\ &\leq C\omega(h). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in a neighborhood of a non-contact point, $Mu(x)$ is semi-concave with semi-concavity modulus $\omega(h)$. □

We are now in position to apply the general estimate obtained in the previous section.

Theorem 5. *Let u be the solution to the fully nonlinear stochastic impulse control problem*

$$\begin{cases} F(D^2u) \geq 0 & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u(x) \leq \mathrm{M}u(x) & \forall x \in \Omega. \\ u = 0 & \forall x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ a bounded domain with a $C^{2,\alpha}$ boundary $\partial\Omega$, and define the obstacle,

$$Mu(x) = \varphi(x) + \inf_{\substack{\xi \geq 0 \\ x+\xi \in \bar{\Omega}}} (u(x+\xi)).$$

Where $\varphi(x)$ is $\omega(r)$ semi-concave, strictly positive, bounded, and decreasing in the positive cone $\xi \geq 0$. Then, the solution u has a modulus of continuity $\omega(r)$ up to $C^{1,1}(\Omega)$.

Proof. The previous theorem shows that $Mu(x)$ is $\omega(r)$ semi-concave. Set $\varphi_u(x) = -Mu(x)$ and note that φ_u is $\omega(r)$ semi-convex. We apply the estimates from the previous section to conclude. □

References

[1] Bensoussan, A., *Stochastic Control by Functional Analysis Methods*, Studies in Mathematics and its Applications Volume 11 (1982).

[2] Bensoussan, A. and Lions, J.-L., *Applications of variational inequalities in stochastic control* Studies in Mathematics and its Applications, 1982.

[3] Caffarelli L., Freidman, A., *Regularity of the Solution of the Quasi-variational Inequality for the Impulse Control Problem*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 3(8), 745-753 (1978).

[4] Caffarelli, L., Freidman, A., *Regularity of the Solution of the Quasi-variational Inequality for the Impulse Control Problem II*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 4(3), 279-291 (1979).

[5] Caffarelli, L. and Cabré, X., *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 43. American Mathematical Society, 1995.

[6] Caffarelli, L., *Obstacle Problem Revisited*, The Journal of Fourier Analysis, (4-5) 383-402 (1998).

[7] Cannarsa, P., Sinestrari, C., *Semiconcave Functions, Hamilton-Jacobi Equations and Optimal Control*, Birkhauser, 2004.

[8] Friedman, A., Optimal stopping problems in stochastic control, SIAM Rev. 21 (1979), no. 1, 7180.

[9] Ishii, K., *Viscosity solutions of nonlinear second order elliptic PDEs associated with impulse control problems*, Funkcial. Ekvac. 36 (1993), no. 1, 123141.

[10] Ishii, K. and Yamada, N., *Viscosity solutions of nonlinear second order elliptic PDEs involving nonlocal operators*, Osaka J. Math. 30 (1993), no. 3, 439455.

[11] Ishii, K., *Viscosity solutions of nonlinear second-order elliptic PDEs associated with impulse control problems. II*, Funkcial. Ekvac. 38 (1995), no. 2, 297328.

[12] Lee, K., *Obstacle problems for the fully nonlinear elliptic operators*, Thesis (Ph.D.)New York University. 1998. 53 pp.

[13] Lions, J.-L., *Free boundary problems and impulse control*, Fifth Conference on Optimization Techniques (Rome, 1973), Part I, pp. 116123. Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Vol. 3, Springer, Berlin, 1973.

[14] Mosco, U., *Implicit variational problems and quasi variational inequalities*, Nonlinear operators and the calculus of variations (Summer School, Univ. Libre Bruxelles, Brussels, 1975), pp. 83156. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 543, Springer, Berlin, 1976.